

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed October 9, 2007 ("the Office Action"). At the time of the Office Action, Claims 22, 23, 25-31, 33, 34, 37, 39, and 67-73 were pending. Claims 22, 23, 26-31, 33, 34, 37, 39, 72, and 73 were rejected. Claims 67 and 68 were allowed. Claims 22, 26, and 69-71 are amended. Claim 25 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and Claims 1-21, 24, 32, 35, 36, 38, 40-66 were previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Claim Objections

Examiner objected to Claims 25 and 26 because they are dependent on canceled Claim 24, which is due to a clerical error in Applicants' Request for Continued Examination. Applicants have amended Claim 26 to depend from Claim 22, as examined by the Examiner in the Office Action. Claim 25 has been cancelled.

Claims 22, 23, 26-31, 33, 34, 37, 39, and 67-73 are Allowable.

- Independent Claims 67 and 68.

The Examiner indicated that Claims 67 and 68 are allowable. (Office Action, page 9).

- Independent Claim 22 and Dependent Claims 23, 26-31, 33, 34, 37, 39, 72, and 73

The Examiner indicated that dependent Claim 25 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of any base and intervening claims. (Office Action, page 8).

Thus, Applicants have amended independent Claim 22 to incorporate the limitations of Claim 25. Applicants have removed the limitation "a conserving device," which should not affect the allowability of the claim.

Thus, Applicants submit that amended Claim 22, incorporating the limitations of Claim 25, is allowable, as well as Claims 23, 25-31, 33, 34, 37, 39, 72, and 73 that depend from amended Claim 22.

- Dependent Claims 69, 70, and 71

The Examiner indicated that dependent Claims 69-71, each of which depends directly from Claim 22, would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of any base and intervening claims. (Office Action, page 8).

Thus, Applicants have rewritten each of Claims 69, 70, and 71 as an independent claim, each incorporating all limitations of base Claim 22, except for the limitation “a conserving device,” which should not affect the allowability of the claims.

Thus, Applicants submit that each of amended Claims 69, 70, and 71 is allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest effort to place this case in condition for allowance in light of the amendments and remarks set forth above. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of Claims 22, 23, 26-31, 33, 34, 37, 39, and 67-73 as amended.

Applicants authorize the Commissioner to charge a total of \$630 for three independent claims, as the amendments to Claims 69-71 result in a total of six independent claims in this Application.

Applicants believe there are no other fees due at this time; however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees necessary or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2148 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

If there are any matters concerning this Application that may be cleared up in a telephone conversation, please contact Applicants' attorney at 512.322.2689.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorney for Applicants

EMGll.

Eric M. Grabski
Reg. No. 51,749

Date: January 9, 2008

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
CUSTOMER ACCOUNT NO. **31625**
512.322.2689
512.322.8320 (fax)